THEOLOGY

Vol. LXIII MAY, 1960 No. 479

Rowland Williams

In the Michaelmas term of 1836 a freshman came up to King's College, Cambridge, from Eton: and in the course of his first letter home he wrote:

> I am getting through my freshman's week pretty tolerably, but find many bores in the shape of writing out statutes, Latin letters, etc. . . . We have chapel every morning at eight, which is an inconvenience, notwithstanding the bewildering beauty of the building. Poor Simeon died to-day, and is much regretted throughout the university. . . .
>
> My greatest difficulty at King's will be to keep up religious feelings. A certain party in the college is such as to throw everything into extremes, and it is difficult to avoid being either a fanatic or a profligate. . . .

Happily he seems to have steered a middle course between these perils. But about a quarter of a century later, Rowland Williams became one of the most talked-of men in England and remained so for some years. As 1960 is the centenary year of the publication of the volume which resulted in his fame—or notoriety—it is appropriate that his memory should be revived.[1]

He became a Fellow of the College in 1839, was ordained by the Visitor in 1842 upon his fellowship, and was classical tutor from 1843 till 1850. He was described as the only great Aristotelian lecturer in Cambridge. In 1850 he returned to his native country on his appointment to the Vice-Principalship of St David's College, Lampeter, but he retained his fellowship at King's and was often in Cambridge. His ecclesiastical troubles began five years later, when as select preacher before the University he embarked upon a course of four sermons, which were afterwards published under the title *Rational Godliness*. The subject of the second sermon was "The Relation of Scripture to Modern Science and Criticism" and it is said to have caused a sensation in the university both on account of the eloquence and earnestness of the preacher and the novelty of his opinions.

They were not in fact as novel as they seemed. Rowland Williams was more than a disciple of any previous teacher: but he had found Coleridge's hints about the Bible and inspiration and revelation illuminating, and had followed them up. He was also—what was rare in those days—closely acquainted with the work of German philosophers, theologians and biblical critics, and he had found not loss but gain to his faith as a Christian in the broader views of the nature of the Bible and of divine revelation which had as yet won little acceptance in England.

It happened that after the delivery of his second sermon Williams'

[1] This article may be regarded as a sequel or tail-piece to those by Mr O. W. Jones on "Rational Godliness: a Welsh controversy" and by Mr P. O. G. White on "Essays and Reviews": see Theology, February 1958 and February 1960.

father became seriously ill and he had to go home and abandon the rest of his course. Thereupon a combination of academic and ecclesiastical malevolence set in motion a rumour that the heads of colleges had prohibited him from completing his course. This baseless rumour was circulated by the church newspapers and by the press in Wales. Many pious clerical breasts in the Principality were struck by the fear that such teaching was being given at Lampeter to candidates for the ministry. King's on the other hand, perhaps characteristically, displayed its confidence in Williams by immediately inviting him to deliver the Founder's Day sermon which was then preached on Lady Day.

His troubles at this time were in fact concentrated in Wales. There were two bishops in Wales at this time who were eminent for their learning, both of them Cambridge men: Dr Ollivant of Llandaff, who had been Regius Professor of Divinity, and Dr Thirlwall of St David's, who had been precocious from his childhood—he had learned Latin at the age of three, and when four was reading Greek with an ease and fluency that astonished all who heard him: in due course he had shone as a tutor at Trinity, but had been dismissed for publicly advocating the admission of dissenters to the university, and in other ways he had appeared as an advanced liberal.

The Bishop of Llandaff, in the course of a long charge to his diocese, roundly condemned Williams' opinions, opening with a precarious gambit that is sometimes rashly favoured by those who are averse to new ideas of any kind: "At the very time", he wrote, "when the Continental theologians, sick at heart of the rationalism which for many years has been preying on the vitals of their Christianity, are returning to sounder principles of biblical interpretation, and grasping with a firmer hold the faith that was once delivered to the saints, we, who have hitherto escaped these extravagances, are invited to enter on the course which they are abandoning in disgust, and, with their experience before our eyes, to launch upon an unknown sea of scepticism and infidelity" (p. 25).

However, this was not out of character in Dr Ollivant, whose mind was set in the old ways of thinking. It was otherwise with Dr Thirlwall, who was both bishop of the diocese in which Lampeter is situated and Visitor of the College. He was presented with a memorial signed by a considerable number of his clergy urging him to dismiss the Vice-Principal. This the bishop declined to do—on legal rather than on theological grounds; he was in fact evasive with regard to the real questions that had been raised. And he suggested to Williams that he should voluntarily resign.

Williams refused to do anything of the kind; he was convinced of the rightness of his cause and that the future would vindicate him. He was also doing a much-needed work in raising the standard of theological education in Wales: he was popular with his pupils who were sensible of his genuine piety as well as of his learning: and he had expected to receive support from the most liberal bishop on the bench.

He was not prepared to take the episcopal admonitions lying down,

and eventually after some private correspondence he published a long open letter to the bishop, entitled *An earnestly respectful letter to the Lord Bishop of St David's on the difficulty of bringing theological questions to an issue.* It is an impressive document, and the rightness of its contentions would now be generally admitted in informed theological circles. Unfortunately, however, Williams did not evince that measure of respect for his bishop to which the successors of the apostles conceived themselves to be entitled.

His "earnestly respectful" letter contained such sentences as these:

> On one point I have to thank your lordship for awaking as if out of a trance, to do me a morsel of justice.

and again:

> Glancing over such sermons as I possess from a right reverend hand, which might furnish one with models, I do not find in the whole collection as much distinctively evangelical doctrine as in almost any discourse of mine taken at random.

Or again:

> Do for Isaiah as much as you are thought to have done for Homer; but condescend to lay aside those oscillating ambiguities which render the Sibylline oracles clear by comparison.

These were well-aimed shafts, but alas! Williams was no match for Thirlwall in sheer dialectics and the resources of sarcasm. The bishop was stung into publishing a rejoinder much longer than Williams' open letter. It was a masterpiece of the *odium theologicum* but otherwise does little credit to his memory. He was prostituting his gift for caustic writing, in a cause which he would live to regret that he had espoused.

Meanwhile, King's had come again to the help of Rowland Williams. Realizing the uncertainty of his survival at Lampeter, the College presented him to its living of Broadchalke with Bowerchalke, near Salisbury. The Bishop of Salisbury was not altogether welcoming: he conveyed to Williams, before he agreed to institute him, that he had taken legal advice whether he could safely refuse the institution.

The parish was not in a good condition: the previous incumbent had held it for forty-five years, of which he had resided for only sixteen. Among other things, there was no vicarage. While one was being built, Williams continued his work at Lampeter in term time, having a curate at Broadchalke. At this time he also married and so ceased to be a fellow of King's. So far as I can ascertain, he was an excellent parish priest, who adapted himself admirably to the service of his rural flock. He was far from being an arid intellectual.

Hitherto his troubles had been more or less confined to Wales, but after 1860, when *Essays and Reviews* was published, nation-wide obloquy was heaped upon him. There is no need to describe again the panic-stricken reactions which the appearance of this volume evoked. The seven essayists found themselves fired on from all quarters: among other things, they were spoken of as the "Seven Extinguishers of the Seven Lamps of the Apocalypse". But the first

major assault came from a non-Christian positivist who maintained that they had no business to be masquerading in the Church, if they held such liberal views. It is often the case that unbelievers are put out by the discovery that there are Christians who are not obsurantists.

Then, the leaders of the high church and evangelical parties, who were usually at daggers drawn, joined in petitioning for the condemnation of the essayists. As was observed at the time, "names which, even in the placid stillness of the printer's type started at their unwonted contiguity, appeared united in common action".

The bishops hurriedly assembled in private conclave, and let themselves be persuaded by Samuel Wilberforce to sign an unanimous declaration of their pained concern and of their intention to defend the faith: the reputedly liberal prelates like Thirlwall and Tait signed along with the rest: and even Bishop Hampden of Hereford, who in the old days had been persecuted by the Tractarians as a heretic, now emerged as the most extreme champion of orthodoxy. He said it was a question between Christianity and Infidelity, and that they ought to prosecute.

And prosecute they did, as best they could. It was found, however, that it was impossible to prosecute all the essayists. There was no way of getting at most of them. The only two who could be proceeded against in the ecclesiastical courts were the two who held benefices in the Church—one of whom was Rowland Williams. Proceedings were also attempted against Benjamin Jowett in the Vice-Chancellor's Court at Oxford, but they were abortive.

The proceedings against Williams were initiated by the Bishop of Salisbury, and there were twenty-two articles of indictment in the Court of Arches. Most of these were dismissed but three were sustained: in particular, Williams was found guilty of having denied the doctrine of biblical inspiration, that is, what is now known as the fundamentalist doctrine.

He was by no means prepared to accept this verdict, for he held that his teaching was entirely consistent with the formularies of the Church of England. He therefore appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and conducted his own defence, because he wanted to be acquitted not on the ground of any of those legal technicalities which lawyers are adept in discovering, but on the ground of what he really believed.

His appeal was successful; though that was not the end of the matter, for the hostile agitators became even more frantic, and the bishops still proceeded to a synodical condemnation of the book, though no longer unanimously.

There was no party to rejoice with Williams in his acquittal. He had genuine affinities with the high churchmen and the evangelicals, as well as with the broad church, but he refused to identify himself with any party, and the high church and the evangelicals had no wish to be identified with him. Indeed, evangelicals abused him for being high; high churchmen abused him for being broad; and broad churchmen were angry because he was not broader. Williams had

in fact disagreed with a good many of the opinions that had been expressed by his fellow-essayists, but he had been too chivalrous to say so, while they were under attack.

He once said that three courses were open before the English Church. "Shall she wed herself to a traditionalism, differing in accident, but not in essence, from that of the Church of Rome? . . . Or shall our Church sink into an apathetic torpor in respect of religious enquiry, and give a wrong direction to a blinded faith, by fettering veracity? . . . Rather, shall our Church, remembering her own Reformers, with the Apostles who went before, and the spirit of her Divine Founder's life and death, disdain blind leaders, and entering upon all knowledge, accept frankly whatever fresh views of literature and science, and whatever tendencies to a larger comprehension may be born, not of human will, but of the will of Him who is not weary of creating and renewing, and who leads us, as we are able to bear it, into the entire Truth?"

Rowland Williams, like other Victorians, was addicted to versification: and he pointed to the tradition, in which he conceived himself to stand, in these words:

> Hooker yet lives, by whom the seeds were sown
> Of reason consecrate in freedom's power;
> Butler made Nature minister to Faith;
> Cudworth in Gentile hearts found heavenly awe;
> In Barclay's page still Gospel Freedom stayeth,
> And Coleridge taught the Spirit's holier law.

Williams died of pneumonia on 18 January 1870, and on his tombstone at Broadchalke these texts are inscribed:

> "The letter killeth. The Spirit giveth life."
> "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

A. R. Vidler.

Religion and Medicine: Priest and Doctor: Church and Hospital—I

The Archbishops' Commission,[1] writing on co-operation between doctors and clergy, says "This Commission recognizes that a good deal of metaphysical thinking is needed before a satisfactory intellectual synthesis can be formulated which will provide a basis for practical co-operation, but at the same time suggests that it will be found in what may be called the 'unity' of the patient."[2]

This paper, while not claiming to be "satisfactory", at least accepts the challenge to think about the relationship between Religion and Medicine.

---

[1] *The Church's Ministry of Healing*. Report of Archbishop's Commission. S.P.C.K., 1958. 2s. 6d.

[2] Para. 122.

THE PRESENT DIVORCE

(1) *From the Church's point of view.* Because of the ready availability of medical treatment in this country, the full significance of the separation between Religion and Medicine is not seen. But what escapes notice here is plainly visible in the Church overseas, for example in West Africa. A missionary church sets out to proclaim the good news of the Kingdom of God in a village, and a young Christian community grows up. Then one of the converts falls sick: but there is often no local hospital round the corner. Either he will make the long journey by lorry to something called the "Government Hospital" or he will turn to a native doctor. In African culture, Religion and Medicine are not divorced and the young convert, through African medicine, may easily find himself with one foot back in the pagan religion from which he has repented. Whether he turns to secular medicine or native medicine, there has been revealed in his life a need which the Church did not meet. The gospel of the Kingdom of God was no good news for him in sickness. He may read his New Testament in dismay—"He sent them to preach the Kingdom of God and to heal the sick"[1]—for the Church has not brought him this gospel. This failure to bring a Saviour who is seen to be the Lord of the whole of life is also visible in other ways; for example, where the congregation suffer from frank malnutrition, but religion is apparently unconcerned with the tilling of the soil.

(2) *From Medicine's point of view.* The power of Medicine to heal organic disease is immensely impressive. Recently too there has been an increase in the physical methods available for treatment of mental disease with a consequent greatly increased turnover in mental hospitals. Psychiatry has taken over the bulk of what used to be the priest's counselling work. Preventive medicine strides ahead. The disappearance of diphtheria, smallpox, and cholera in this country, and the eradication of malaria from Cyprus, are modern examples. Yet there is the shocking implication (in default of witness) that none of this is God's business.

The recent stay of a priest's wife in a psychiatric observation ward of a hospital in London for six weeks without seeing the chaplain, for whom she asked, must remind us of two things. *First*, that, thanks to the provisions of the National Health Service and an increasing interest in doctor/clergy co-operation, such happenings are decreasing. But, *second*, that, so far as most doctors are concerned, the chaplain is still an optional extra. This is not to say that a chaplain's work is not valued; but for Medicine—as a science—Religion is not a power in healing, nor an integral factor in health. It is well to read the B.M.A. Report on Divine Healing and Co-operation between Doctors and Clergy,[2] especially those sections on the religious aspects of healing,[3] to understand medical thought on

[1] St Luke 9. 2.
[2] *Divine Healing and Co-operation between Doctors and Clergy*. B.M.A. 1956.
[3] Vid. sup., paras 22–9.

this. The Report is a brave attempt (based on seventy replies to a questionnaire widely publicized among doctors in Great Britain) to build a bridge from the medical side. But doctors *as scientists* clearly cannot prove the existence of God; or that divine power affects matter, that is to say, heals organic disease.[1] And the discovery of the psychosomatic principle has not solved this problem; for doctors—*as scientists*—see this group of diseases in terms of the action of mind upon body, not the action of spirit working through mind upon body—therefore in terms of psychiatry and not religion. Nevertheless, the deep compassion implicit in medical work does enable doctors, especially general practitioners, to see patients as whole persons. The increasing power to prolong life raises the question "What for?" The effect of relationships, at home and at work, on health raises the questions of *how* to live. And *must* the discovery which gives us radio-active isotopes also give us cases of leukaemia due to radio-active fall out? These are spiritual questions. Man is not just mind and body. He has deeper needs which a humane and widening science of healing cannot overlook. Even doctors who are not Christian neglect them at their peril, for a medicine of mind and body only cannot develop its full possibilities for healing persons. Many doctors who are Christians are wide-awake to these issues; they need the help and leadership of the Church.

Medicine and Religion

Although the B.M.A. Report says "to some extent the work of the doctor and the clergyman or minister overlap",[2] it also says that clergy must "regard their sphere of helpfulness as that pertaining solely to the spiritual life of the patient".[3] The Archbishops' Report does not bring enough light at this point but almost confirms the divorce by saying "Both priest and doctor therefore are dealing with the same sick *person*; to this person each has his own approach. The medical practitioner brings to this unity particular gifts and techniques of a scientific character. A priest seeks to bring to this unity something quite different, the grace of God in Christ."[4]

We must deepen our understanding of the healing ministry of both doctor and priest, for there is a distinct overlap in their work. It ought not to be disconcerting for a priest when a psychiatrist clears up a guilt complex which sacramental confession failed to do. Or disconcerting for a doctor when a priest brings healing to a skin rash which lotions had only aggravated. There is an inseparable link between religion and medicine, and—to put it in the form of a parable—it is time we built churches big enough to contain within them a small hospital, not, as at present, hospitals big enough to contain a small chapel!

Medicine and Religion are bound together in the following ways:

(1) *The Unity of Man.* Both the Archbishops' Report and the

[1] Vid. sup., para. 28.
[2] Vid. sup., para. 48.
[3] Vid. sup., para. 60.
[4] *Archbishops' Report.* Para. 122.

B.M.A. Report make this statement "Man is a unity",[1] though it is clear that doctors—as scientists—can say nothing about the "I" which survives death or about the indwelling Spirit of God. Whereas the Church, by her understanding of man as the "great amphibium", a soul/body creature, means something more by the "unity" of man. But if we really mean that man is a unity, then the Grace of God in Christ may have organic effects in the body of flesh, and the giving of penicillin may affect the spiritual life of the patient: for this soul/body is a unity.

Both the B.M.A. Report and the Archbishops' Report reveal the impossibility of isolating a divine factor in healing, and proving it. God, expressing himself in and through a material world, the continuous incarnation of spirit in matter, is understood through faith. For those without faith, there are other explanations of "divine" healing valid in their own field. Healing, either through prayer or through penicillin, cannot be *proved* divine. But just as there are very physical answers to prayer, so there can be very spiritual results from medicine. Some of the effects of plastic operations upon young delinquents, who have different kinds of blemishes, are certainly spiritual. But are we not already slipping back into the very dualism we are trying to avoid by thinking in these terms? Nevertheless, important practical points arise. Can we recommend someone to a psychiatrist who is not a Christian? Is it possible to carry out a psychiatric treatment without spiritual implications arising from the very nature of personal relationship? Good psychiatrists, Christians or not, do have regard for a patient's spiritual beliefs.

(2) *Faith and Life: Prayer and Works.* It has been said that Jesus' great contribution to religion was that he did away with it; meaning that we cannot label one department of life "religion" and the rest "life", for the whole of life and the living of it is God's business, and a religious activity.

Unfortunately, our use of the word "church" to indicate a building, instead of the living body of Christ whose members we are, has made possible a false distinction between what-goes-on-in-church and life. But just because the whole of life—including what goes on in the hospital wards and the operating theatre—belongs to God, so too is it the Church's business. Medicine is only one method by which God heals. In a mission hospital we can see the theatre staff stand in silence before an operation and commit their healing task to God. And it is true to say that because a surgeon stands and prays with his lips, he can then turn and pray with his hands. Perhaps this also throws light upon the relationship between prayer and works; but certainly when we see the work of doctors in these terms, then the Church's ministry of healing will avoid the trap of building up a holy alternative to a secular science. The very term "church's ministry of healing" may imply a more comfortable alternative to a session in hospital. I have a letter from a district nurse in which she says "I have learnt to inject the Mersalyl as a prayer": she does not

[1] *Archbishops' Report.* Para. 2. *B.M.A.* Para. 29.

say *with* a prayer, she says "*as* a prayer", for here is work rooted in a life of prayer—prayer seen as a habitual state, not as a broken series of acts. Orare est laborare.

(3) *The Kingdom of God.* The twofold commission to preach the good news of the Kingdom of God and to heal the sick given by Jesus to both twelve[1] and seventy[2] puts healing within the context of the work for the Kingdom of God. This is often forgotten by enthusiasts who try to develop a ministry of healing as something separate. In fact the healing ministry grows out of compassion: is rooted in the prayer, fellowship, preaching, and mission of the Church: and is an expression of love. Where compassion is lacking, where the Church does not put the seeking of the Kingdom first, no special kind of service can do substitute.

The glory of present-day medical work, when separated from religion, is stolen glory, which belongs to the Kingdom of God: for the healing work of doctors and nurses is a part of God's work of compassion, redeeming every manifestation of evil in his creation.

The teaching of the Kingdom of God prevents too individualistic an approach to the healing ministry: and sets it firmly as an expression of vitality in the local Christian community. Only in the new life of the Kingdom of God can men realize true wholeness: in soul and body, and in right relationship to God and neighbour. Doctor and priest as individuals, church and hospital as communities, both have their part to play in this commission of our Lord, mediating his love to men in different ways.

(4) *The Sacramental Link.* Spirit is related most closely to matter in a simple yet mysterious way in the Sacraments. One minor Sacrament—anointing with oil—is concerned with healing the sick, based upon its use by the disciples in the early Church for this purpose.[3] In the use of olive oil in this way there were two interwoven lines of thought: the idea of consecration, from its use in the consecration of Jewish kings and priests,[4] and later from its use in baptism/confirmation. But also olive oil was familiar in the home for cooking, lighting, and as a homely remedy for oiling of the skin and rubbing into aches and pains.

In the early Church the sick were not just signed with the sign of the Cross when anointed, as is customary to-day, but there are records of the whole body being anointed with oil—blessed by the bishop[5]—and of repeated daily anointing with steadfast prayer. In addition, both the sick man's medicines, and his food (especially his bread, wine, and grapes) and water were blessed by bishop or presbyters.[6] Water itself (based upon Jesus' sending the blind man to wash in the pool of Siloam[7]—a pool already used for healing) has also been widely used for healing purposes, e.g. Lourdes.

[1] St Luke 9. 2. [2] St Luke 10. 9. [3] St Mark 6. 13. St James 5. 14.
[4] 1 Sam. 10. 1. Exod. 28. 41.
[5] *Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition.* By F. W. Puller. Church Historical Society, pp. 155 ff.
[6] *Liturgy and Worship.* Ed. Lowther Clarke. S.P.C.K., p. 477.
[7] St John 9. 7.

It seems to me that the early Church saw things much more whole than we do. Everything—even a cup of cold water—could be the means of spiritual blessing. Natural and supernatural, spiritual and physical, were seen to be closely related: and a little oil from the lamp, blessed by the bishop, could mysteriously be used by the Creator Spirit for the healing of his creature of flesh and blood.

The anointing of the sick to-day is a pale remnant of this catholic thinking. The restoration of such a sacrament to everyday use in the Church to-day will accomplish little unless it is symbolic of, and accompanied by, a very much deeper insight into the sacramental nature of all created things. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."[1] For the stubborn fact remains that to-day water comes to us from taps, bread ready sliced in hygienic wrappers: and as a nation, we are getting further from nature; olive oil (though still used in the Coronation) is less and less related to either consecration or daily life in the minds of twentieth-century man. If it is desirable for a bishop to bless oil on Maundy Thursday, is it not to-day equally desirable for him to visit the hospital dispensary on St Luke's Day to bless the medicines and the instruments in the operating theatre? But would such blessing be any better understood than the blessing of olive oil is understood unless it was a visible part of a much deeper compassion for the sick in hospitals?—a real blessing which gathered penicillin and hypodermic syringes within the ministry of Christ's hand stretched out to heal.

Because a loaf was taken and broken and blessed, given and eaten, all bread is sanctified to God's good purposes. So because olive oil was taken and blessed, given and received, all medicines are sanctified to God's good purposes. Penicillin blessed by a bishop would be no more effective against staphylococci than unblessed penicillin, which is enormously effective anyway. But a blessing of the hospital dispensary and theatre would proclaim the kingship of Christ over all the earth. A natural ceremony, closely linked in thought to a Rogationtide blessing of the crops and fishing fleet. Perhaps the bottle of *oleum olivae* could be removed from the dispensary shelf and put on the table—for special blessing as a sacrament of the whole.

(5) *Jesus' Ministry*. All the four previous links are different ways of looking at the same truth, for all depend upon the nature of God and his purposes. The ministry of healing is revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ in all its fullness as something true of the Father: implicit in his nature: partaking of his purpose. It is here that unity will be found, and *man's* unity is but a reflection of him in whose image he is made.

Jesus' ministry to the sick brings together natural and supernatural in one glorious ministry in which salvation and healing can share one Greek word in common, σώζω. Sometimes he healed by word (his word was with power), sometimes by touch; by the forgiveness of sins; by anointing a blind man's eyes with clay and spittle—both of them used as native medicines—and sending him to wash; by

[1] 1 Cor. 10. 26.

prayer and fasting. To each in his need he brought the healing power of God to that point where the individual person was bound, by the method which would best free him. Matter is seen to be subservient to spirit, so that natural methods subserve spiritual purposes.

But Jesus' ministry to the sick is also widened and deepened by his death and resurrection.

Sickness is deeply rooted in the sin of a fallen world, in our manner of living in society. During eight years' medical work in Ghana, I saw only one African with a duodenal ulcer, and he had first developed it as a student in this country! Duodenal ulcer—so common here—is a symptom, not just of Tom Jones's anxiety, but also of the anxiety, tension, and cupidity of Western civilization—the way we live together.

Only the full impact of the gospel of the Kingdom of God can effect the redemption of man-in-relationship-to-man: and Jesus died and rose again to win that victory. The healing ministry is therefore implicit in the whole missionary task of the Church, in her worship, prayer, sacraments, ministry of the word, fellowship, and hospitals. Yes, *her* hospitals.

Summary

(1) The Archbishops' Report on the Church's Ministry of Healing invited "metaphysical thinking" about the theory underlying the unity of all healing work, religious or medical.

(2) The divorce between Medicine and the Church is seen to leave both their gospels maimed.

(3) Four aspects of the unity of the Ministry of Healing are discussed: (*a*) in man's nature as a body/soul unity; (*b*) in the relationship between faith and life; (*c*) in the gospel of the Kingdom; and (*d*) in the sacramental link between spirit and matter.

(4) All four points are seen to be rooted in the nature of God and his purpose as revealed by Jesus Christ in his ministry.

(5) Medicine must find its place in the redemptive mission of the Church to the whole of man-in-relationship-to-man.

Michael Wilson.

The World's Conversion — an Idle Dream?

Belief that the world will ultimately be Christian is to-day under a cloud. It is true that many of the hymns still in regular use in most churches speak of a time when "Jesus shall reign where'er the sun Doth his successive journeys run", and bear witness to the hope that one day the Christian faith will win the allegiance of the whole world. But while many still share this belief, expressed so emphatically by Isaac Watts and his successors, others regard it with disfavour as out-moded and as no true part of the Christian message. The purpose of this article is to discuss some of the reasons put forward for abandoning it and to test their cogency. It is an un-

doubted fact that many Christian thinkers treat the very idea of a Christian world with hostility and contempt.

I. IT HAS BEEN DISCREDITED. Last century (say those who make this particular objection) progress was the creed of the times. The success and expansion of the Victorian era, coupled with the doctrine of evolution, combined to produce a sort of cosmic Coué-ism: every day in every way the world is getting better and better. The ridiculous idea gained currency that the mere lapse of time brought improvement—as if anything produced by the nineteenth century was automatically better than anything thrown up in the ninth. All that we have passed through in the present century has shown how shallow this belief was. Two world wars have blown such hopes sky high. Belief in a Christian world was simply a christianized version of progress. By its abandonment we can see more clearly what the Gospel is about. It is concerned with far deeper themes than a neat little H. G. Wells Utopia. . . .

In reply to this it may be agreed that the secular doctrine of progress has been exploded; but it must be pointed out that the hope of a Christian world is far older and it had a different origin from the one suggested. In fact, matters are really the other way round. It is not the Church which has allowed a secular belief to invade it; the very doctrine of progress arose in the first place because of Christian inspiration, as Dr John Baillie has shown in his book *The Belief in Progress*. It became absurd when detached from its Christian roots.

The hymn quoted at the opening ("Jesus shall reign . . .") was written by Watts who was born in 1674! The conversion of the world to Christianity was taught by John Wesley, by John Newton, by Jonathan Edwards, by John Bunyan and by many before them.[1] This first objection therefore is based upon a misunderstanding.

II. IT IS UNSCRIPTURAL. The Bible holds out no such hope. In fact the reverse is indicated; times are to wax worse until the age finally closes in apostasy and the reign of Antichrist.

In reply to this I would point out that anything can be proved by quoting odd verses of scripture. Many passages of a very different character could be brought forward. What of the Lord's Prayer which speaks of the doing of God's will "in earth as in heaven"? What of St Paul's words that "all Israel shall be saved"; and "if the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" (Romans xi). What of all the visions of the Old Testament, of men beating their swords into ploughshares? Is Christianity to throw all this away?

As for the passages which refer to final apostasy and Antichrist, there is nothing distinctively Christian about them; these are simply Jewish beliefs which the early Christians took over. Later on, Augustine and others said that they applied only to the last three and a

[1] Evidence for this, with ample quotations, may be found in my book *His Appearing and His Kingdom: the Christian Hope in the light of its History*. (London, 1953.)

half years of the present age. They should not be allowed to colour our whole philosophy of history. Moreover, in 1 John it is made clear that Antichrist is not something reserved for the distant future but the reference is to what had already taken place: "even now have there arisen many antichrists" (ii. 18). The apostasy spoken of in the New Testament is something that had begun in the time of the writers. "Little children, it is the last hour: and as ye heard that antichrist cometh, even now have there arisen many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last hour." As a matter of fact it was not the last hour; nineteen centuries have followed. And although various New Testament writers assured their readers that the end of all things was at hand, time has shown that they were wrong. It is curious to take these isolated statements about apostasy, to ignore the fact that they referred to the original time of writing, and to allow them to govern our whole thought of the future!

III. It is unnecessary. This world is a school and is essentially temporary, preparatory and transitional. We need not trouble about its imperfections. Since the world is a "vale of soul-making", a mixture of good and evil is an ideal training-ground for immortal spirits.

In reply, one may agree that this is an aspect of the world which we need to remember; but on the other hand, can we remain completely indifferent to the question whether the world becomes more Christian or less, whether the Kingdom of Christ in human hearts grows or diminishes? Our ordinary schools are temporary and preparatory, but we want them to be as good as we can make them; and the life and work of those who have passed through them will be all the better if the school itself is good and Christian. We do not want a school for our children to have a leaky roof, with fever in the drains and walls oozing with slime. Nor do we wish the teachers to train them in Fascism or to give them an example of profligacy; we want the training, example and influence to be Christian. The condition of the world has a profound effect on the souls that pass through it and one would have thought that for this reason, if for no other, a Christian should strive to make the whole world as Christian as possible.

Some Christian thinkers have suggested that each man crosses the flowing stream of history and it doesn't matter much where the river flows to or what direction it takes. The important thing is the opposite bank of eternity. This, however, seems to be far too individualistic a view; and even when it is emphasized that eternity means the communion of saints, an attitude of sheer indifference to the development of the world hardly accords with Christian teaching on love to one's neighbour. Have we not had enough generations blighted from birth, enough who have lived and died in darkness "without a ray to cheer the tomb"? If we are to act in the world at all, how can we aim at anything less than the supremacy of Christ who is the world's rightful ruler and king? If we thought more about millions of our fellows who are

> Like plants in mines which never saw the sun,
> But dream of him, and guess where he may be,

we should regard this question in a less doctrinaire fashion. According to our faith it shall be done unto us. If we face our task in the belief that Christians will always be a little flock, then we shall be subconsciously unnerved by a dismal fatalism.

In our revulsion from Wellsian Utopias and Godwinian nonsense and Marxist blue-prints we are in danger of losing sight of the purpose of God. We are in danger too of becoming too individualistic and ignoring the social relevance of Christianity. We can never overcome the false ideologies in the world today unless we have something more spacious and comprehensive.

IV. It is unobtainable. Because of original sin, a Christian world is quite impossible; each generation has to fight the battle of good and evil afresh. Every new baby brings a new dose of selfishness into the world, and no permanent and settled advance can be made. Every achievement is jeopardized by a new centre of free-will. This seems to support the rather dreary but inevitable conclusion that history will always be a ding-dong battle, or a chess-board with the black and white squares evenly matched. A character in Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* says to himself, "As if anything could be changed! In this world of men nothing can be changed—neither happiness nor misery. They can only be displaced at the cost of corrupted consciences and broken lives . . ."

In J. Welldon Johnson's *Autobiography of an Ex-coloured Man*, an American millionaire who figures in the book expresses very forcibly this pessimistic conclusion. He says we cannot annihilate evil any more than we can annihilate physical and chemical forces; we can only change their form. We smash slavery, he goes on, but far from destroying it we merely scatter it into a dozen other forms—political corruption, unjust laws, cruelty and fear. We attack disease, but our philanthropy simply preserves strains of insanity and weakness for future generations.

In reply it may be urged that, however plausibly this view may be put forward, it hardly does justice to the Christian faith. If evil is a fixed quantity which cannot be worn down but only changed into a myriad protean forms, it is futile to do anything about it. The effect of such a belief is the same as that of the Eastern Karma, according to which the just penalty for sin can never be escaped, and therefore it is impossible to do anyone a real kindness; if you save anyone from misfortune it will come to him in some other way. This spirit of fatalism, so prevalent in the East, is a constant drag on the life of the people, and one that can be removed only by the Christian faith with its message of a living God, a Saviour, who gives pardon and grace, who *takes away* the sin of the world, carries it upon his own heart, bears it away as a cleansing stream carries the foulness and refuse of a great city to the open sea. We must not allow our Christian faith to become entangled with a world-view indistinguishable from Karma. If we do, it will lead to a similar paralysis of action. Paul does say that the powers of the evil world are coming to nought (1 Corinthians ii. 6; i. 28). The idea that evil is a fixed and irreducible quantity is very difficult to grasp. The Gospel maintains

that evil can be overcome with good; the Cross shows how the sin of men can be over-ruled and caught up into the divine purpose and transmuted into a redeeming energy.

If the doctrine of the Incarnation is true, if God has sent forth his Son into the world, then we are warranted in looking for some adequate result within the sphere into which he was sent and within which his Spirit is at work. Criticisms have sometimes been made that the results of Christ's coming are not commensurate with the stupendous fact announced by the Christian faith—"the Word became flesh"; and though these criticisms are often inspired by hostility and ignorance the critics are quite right in expecting the Incarnation to make a real difference to the world situation. The New Testament appeals to the works of Christ in confirmation of its faith. We too can point to his deeds through the centuries, the Gesta Christi; and we ought not to doubt their continuance or to limit their range.

V. Other objections could be considered, but they are of less weight. Those who urge that a Christian world is unthinkable because the material world is the realm of death and imperfection seem to be hovering on the borders of Gnosticism. The flawless life of Jesus was lived out in earthly and temporal conditions. True, life on earth can be only provisional and preparatory, but that is another matter. No one is suggesting that a Christian world can ever be a substitute for the eternal life. There is no reason why we cannot believe in both. Here it is good to recall the teaching of Dante, whom no one would accuse of a secular outlook. In his *De Monarchia*, he speaks of the two-fold goal of humanity. One refers to man's earthly life and the other to his immortal soul, but both are embraced in the divine purpose.

> Providence has established two goals to be contemplated by man, viz. the blessedness of this life which consists in the activity of his proper power and is figured by the terrestrial paradise; and the blessedness of the eternal life which consists in the fruition of the divine aspect, to which his proper power may not ascend unless assisted by the divine light. And this blessedness is given to be understood by the celestial paradise (iii, 16).

We may close by referring to the interesting fact that belief in the ultimate victory of Christ's Kingdom on earth is by no means excluded in official Roman Catholic teaching. In the *Teaching of the Catholic Church* (edited by G. D. Smith, 1948), A. Vonier, O.S.B., the writer of the particular section in question, while rejecting Millenarianism with its expectation of the literal presence of Christ on the earth, affirms that to believe in a period, more or less prolonged, of triumphant sanctity as the culmination of human history is a different matter. If such a period of spiritual triumph is to arrive, he continues, it will come through the operation of those influences now at work in the Christian Church. "It is not at all certain that there may not be a prolonged period of triumphant Christianity before the end."

T. Francis Glasson.

Latter-Day Saints and Christians

THE building recently at great cost of a Mormon temple in Surrey has called attention to the fact that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormons, is not merely a curious byway, virtually if not quite forgotten and extinct, of American nineteenth-century religion. Mormonism is in fact very much alive.

In the U.S.A., the Mormons are now far more numerous even than the adherents of Christian Science. In the state of Utah, the great majority of whose population is still Mormon, the Mormon Church, through subsidiary corporations, very largely controls trade and industry: their whole economic life is centrally organized, with co-operative marketing boards and the like: and their prosperity is probably largely due to this. In the early days of their settlement in the West, their appeal was in part an economic one, and this explains why they recruited their members so largely by emigration from Europe, emigration which they carefully helped and organized: at one point, a third of all British migrants to the U.S.A. were Mormon converts. The Secretary for Agriculture in President Eisenhower's administration, Mr Ezra Taft Benson, is a Mormon Apostle. Politically, they are on the whole a very conservative group, although they at times claim that they have been ahead of the times in their views of economic co-operation as of plural marriage.

Mormon missionaries are active in England, perhaps most of all on new housing estates, just where the Church is most vulnerable. While the number of their adherents is not great (about 10,000, out of a total for Europe of 36,000), it is significant that of their ninety-five chapels here, over twenty have been built in the last three or four years.

Last year, despite the protests of all the Lutheran bishops, the Danish Ministry of Church Affairs, in a departmental circular, directed the clergy to lend the parish registers in their possession to the regional record offices, where Mormons would be allowed to have them photographed in order to use the information for their baptisms by proxy of deceased persons.

And the activities and missions of the Latter-day Saints are far from being limited to the U.S.A. and Europe. Anglican Church leaders in the South Pacific, for instance, are perturbed by their inroads: in all the island groups they are spending very large sums of money in building places of worship and schools.

The Mormons abandoned "plural marriage" over sixty years: and they claim to be definitely Christian and Trinitarian: entrance to their Church is gained by baptism: they hold that through the Atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved: and the Bible is the Word of God, so far as it is correctly translated. And Dr T. Elmer Clark claims[1] that their faith is substantially that of traditional Protestantism, with the distinctive additions of "plural marriage",

[1] *The Small Sects in America*, rev. edition, pp. 130–2.

now abandoned, and baptism for the dead. Dr W. L. Sperry speaks[1] of the Latter-day Saints and Christian Science as the two chief American additions to the diversity of Protestant denominations. He also claims[2] that present-day Mormons do not attach too much importance to the naive legends of the early days (I cannot get any confirmation of this from Mormon sources, though no doubt it is true of some individual Mormons). "Urbanus", writing some months ago in the *Church Times*, seemed to suggest that the Mormons have as good a right as the Society of Friends or the Salvation Army to be represented in the British Council of Churches.

How deep and fundamental are in fact the divergences of contemporary Mormonism from the main Christian tradition, and in particular from the Free Churches which sit most loose to this? There certainly seem to be some misunderstandings.[3] For example, it does not seem, as some writers have stated, that plural marriage was ever compulsory, and it is even doubtful whether it was ever practised by a majority of the Saints.[4] The statement that they hold Christ's Atonement to be limited to the pre-Mormon dispensation seems to conflict with the third of their thirteen Articles of Belief. As regards the statement that they regard Christ, Mohammed, Joseph Smith and Brigham Young as all (and equally) manifestations of deity, I am assured that while Mohammed was a great leader, Moses and Abraham were ancient prophets, Joseph Smith and Brigham Young were modern prophets, they were human in every sense of the word: being prophets, they received revelations from God, and so might be called God's representatives on earth: but Christ alone remains the literal "Son of God". As to their holding that Jesus at Cana married Mary and Martha (thus giving a sanction to plural marriage), I am informed (by the Headquarters of the Mormon British Mission) that Orson Pratt, an early Mormon missionary, who became a well-known Mormon leader, held that Christ was married: but that the Mormon Church does not now, and has not in the past, taught that Christ was married.

Nevertheless, the divergencies of Mormonism from historic Christianity are profound, even though much of their language, and even some of their thought, is very similar to it. The root of these diver-

[1] *Religion in America* (1945), p. 82.

[2] Ibid., p. 83.

[3] It is clearly best to see what the Latter-day Saints themselves say, instead of merely repeating what non-Mormon writers, who do not seem always to have read Mormon writings, say. The two chief Mormon Scriptures are the Book of Mormon and *Doctrine and Covenants*. J. E. Talmage, *The Articles of Faith* (14th edition, 1925), is still recommended as the standard exposition of Latter-day Saint beliefs. Gordon B. Hinckley, *What of the Mormons?* (1954), is also commended. LeGrant Richards, *A marvellous work and a wonder* (1950), gives a good recent presentation by a Mormon leader—the author is a Presiding Bishop and one of the Twelve Apostles. Ray B. West, *Kingdom of the Saints* (1957–8) is by one who grew up in the Mormon Church and remains sympathetic, though not now actually a member. Many pamphlets are also issued by the Latter-day Saints.

[4] Richards, op. cit., p. 425, claims that it was never practised by more than three per cent of members of the Mormon Church.

gencies is to be found in the authoritative position given to the Mormon prophet and founder, Joseph Smith, and the revelations claimed to have been given to him. Only the earlier of these revelations are to be found in the Book of Mormon, the Bible of the Latter-day Saints.

The Book of Mormon[1] is supposed to have been written by the Prophet Mormon about A.D. 400, to have been buried in the hill Cumorah, and by the help of the Angel Moroni to have been found by Joseph Smith in 1823 (when he was eighteen years of age). It was, it is claimed, inscribed in Reformed Egyptian on gold plates and translated by Smith: but it was never seen by anyone else except by three adherents, and was removed by angelic agency. It is for the most part an historical account of how, about 600 B.C., many Jews migrated to America, and of how Jesus Christ went there after his resurrection and preached to them, and established his Church: and of how, after internecine wars about A.D. 400 among the Jews in America, as a result of which they were dying out, the prophet Mormon wrote this book and buried it, to await a great prophet who should come in a future age. The Book of Mormon was published in 1830, and the Mormon Church was organized a month later.

Many of the most characteristic Latter-day Saint doctrines and practices are not referred to in the Book of Mormon, and are based on revelations alleged to have been made later either to Joseph Smith or to his followers. It is, in fact, emphasized that one should not depend entirely on the written word: one should, on the other hand, accept the principle of continuous revelation.[2]

If the Bible, "as far as it is correctly translated", is regarded as the word of God (and it is claimed that every doctrine revealed in the Bible is unqualifiedly accepted by the Latter-day Saints),[3] this is no less true of the Book of Mormon. The latter is regarded as a necessary addition to the Old Testament and the New Testament, and indeed as standing in relation to the New Testament much as the New Testament stands to the Old Testament: the Old Testament and the New Testament are not the final and absolute authority except for what the Mormons consider the first two dipensations of time: the Book of Mormon is a similar authority for this the final dispensation.[4]

The Bible, perhaps naturally, is held to foretell Mormonism: in Rev. 14. 6–7 the angel with the everlasting gospel is the angel Moroni with the Book of Mormon. Jacob's prophecy in Genesis 49 was fulfilled when the Lord led a company of people, descendants of Joseph, from Jerusalem to the western continent. The two sticks referred to in Ezekiel 37 are the Bible and the Book of Mormon.

But not even the Book of Mormon, though it is called the word of God, is really the final authority for the Latter-day Saints: this is rather the revelations claimed to have been received by Joseph Smith

[1] This has been translated into about twenty-eight different languages.
[2] Cf. Richards, op. cit., pp. 153 ,156; and J. E. Talmage, op. cit., pp. 302–11.
[3] Cf. Elder D. M. McAllister, *Life's greatest questions*, p. 27.
[4] Cf. Ray B. West, op. cit., p. 279. Richards, op. cit., p. 71, speaks of the "divinity" of the Book of Mormon.

and his followers, and the Prophet Joseph Smith himself. This is in effect admitted—"The Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints has its foundation in the revelations (Joseph Smith) received, the sacred truths he taught, and the authority of the Priesthood restored through him."[1] It is said that Joseph Smith is revered as a Prophet of God like the prophets in the Bible. But in effect he is given a dominant position (though there is indeed no claim that he is an incarnation)—and the new convert before baptism must acknowledge belief in the divine nature of Joseph Smith's mission—a vague phrase, no doubt, but one that can be understood to mean a great deal.

And they do diverge otherwise also considerably from the historic Christian faith. Their attitude, for example, is Judaistic—their third Article of Faith states that "through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel"—apparently not by faith in Christ; and indeed Richards explicitly states "One erroneous teaching of many Christian churches is 'By faith alone are we saved' ".[2]

God is conceived as an exalted man, with a body like a man, and as married: it is a Mormon principle that "as man is, God once was: as God is, man may become": and a well-known Mormon hymn sets out Joseph Smith's concept of the married God.[3] There is even a polytheistic element in the Mormon doctrine of God—God is the God of this world, and there are other gods for other worlds.[4] The three members of the Trinity are separate in body, and One only in purpose.

But of course the two most striking divergencies of the Latter-day Saints from historic Christianity are their customs of baptism for the dead and plural marriage: and if the latter has been abandoned, at least in practice, the former is, if anything, more flourishing than ever. It is an answer of a sort to the inevitable problem of the fate of those who died without a knowledge of Christ, or, rather more precisely, before the Mormon dispensation. It is based in part on St Paul's cryptic reference in 1 Cor. 15. 29 to people who are baptized for the dead: in part on the conviction that baptism, and Mormon baptism at that, is absolutely, not only "generally", necessary for salvation[5]: it must be performed by those with authority, and none but the Latter-day Saints have authority. 1 Peter 3. 19 says that Christ preached to the dead, and it is reasonable therefore that they should at least by proxy be baptized: whereas the Bible does not say that we should pray for them. The Book of Mormon does not prescribe such a custom: it was only some years after its publication that in 1836 Elijah appeared to Joseph, in fulfilment of Micah

[1] *Joseph Smith tells his own story*, p. 24.
[2] Op. cit., p. 25.
[3] Ray B. West, op. cit., p. 118.
[4] Ibid., pp. 280–1.
[5] Cf. John 3. 5: there is no distinction between the living and the dead: only children who die in infancy, having no sin to expiate, are exempt: cf. the pamphlet *Latter-day Saint Temples*.

4. 5–6, at Kirtland, Ohio, and gave the revelation on which this practice is based: men were to prepare their genealogies, and build temples in which they could be baptized for their forefathers (baptism of the living, on the other hand, can be performed anywhere): baptism must be by immersion, and is not for children. Justice, mercy and common-sense revolt at the idea of God rejecting people for not obeying a law which they did not know, as modern Christendom holds. Christ preached to the departed spirits, and he promised his disciples that the works which he did they should do also: and the Gospel is to be preached to all the dead who could not hear it while living in the flesh.[1] Baptism for the dead is a corollary of this: it seems to be taken for granted that the dead will have faith (for baptism of the living, at all events, this is explicitly stated to be necessary).

It is stated to have been in 1831 that the rightfulness of a plurality of wives under certain limitations and special conditions was made known to Joseph Smith. But it was only very gradually that this came to be at all generally accepted and announced: and the official Mormon view is that while Smith now received sanction for it, he was told the time was not yet ripe to publish such a revelation. He himself apparently began to practise polygamous marriage secretly in 1836: a recent biographer,[2] by no means hostile to him, gives a list of forty-nine wives, and suggests he had many more, though a few of these marriages were with older women and solely for the purpose of celestial reward. The underlying motives were perhaps not only sensuality and libertinism. It was assumed that there were large numbers of God's spiritual children pre-existing, and that it was man's mission to clothe these in tabernacles of flesh: the more children the Latter-day Saints had, the quicker could Zion, or the Kingdom of God, the gathering of the Saints, be built up in America, and that was after all their duty. Some, perhaps many, plural marriages are claimed to have been made in order to supply protection and care to superfluous women: and it is stated to be significant for the sense of responsibility so strong in them that so many were made during the final period of persecution at Nauvoo, when single women might be thought to be particularly in need of protection. It was not till 1852 that the doctrine of plural marriage was made public: it was then claimed to be based on a revelation to Joseph Smith in 1843. But reports of it were widespread long before that, and were a main cause of the many difficulties in which Mormons were involved, and which culminated in the riot in 1844 in which Joseph Smith lost his life. In the early days comparatively few of the poorer Mormons practised polygamy, very probably for financial reasons. Brigham Young married six of Joseph Smith's widows to raise up more children for the Prophet. He had originally accepted the principle of plural marriage with some misgiving, but came to have no doubt that it was of God, and that given time it would work. In all

[1] Talmage, op. cit., pp. 147 seq.
[2] Fawn M. Brodie, *No man knows my history*.

he married twenty-seven women (not all the wives were alive at any one time), and had fifty-four children, excluding adopted and step-children.

If polygamy was no original part of Mormonism, neither was it adopted with the aim of attracting adherents: on the contrary, it was the chief source of all the great troubles which the Latter-day Saints provoked, including the violent death of their founder: not all the Saints themselves could be won over to it, and it caused many apostasies. The Mormons were not the only people in nineteenth-century America to have unusual ideas about marriage: the Oneida Community, for example, under J. H. Noyes, practised community in wives.

As we have seen, the motives for the practice of plural marriage were perhaps not entirely sensual. The strong Judaic and Old Testament strain in the Mormon movement would clearly facilitate the adoption of plural marriage, especially in the absence of any belief in a Church to interpret and teach the Bible. Sometimes it may really have seemed the best way of providing, in a society without social services, for widows and otherwise unattached women. But even if the L.D.S. in part practised it from a sense of religious conviction, there was clearly more to it. Joseph Smith seems to have been good-looking, and both attractive to, and attracted by, women: while the women whom Brigham Young married in his later years were young and perhaps attractive . . .

The Mormons wanted Utah to be accepted as one of the States, rather than merely a territory: it was clear that this would not be granted as long as plural marriage (which reformers like Harriet Beecher Stowe and advocates of women's rights bracketed with slavery) was allowed: and so in 1890 the then head of the Mormon Church undertook that the Church would give up the custom. Some at least of those who had undertaken responsibilities towards several wives were allowed to keep them. It always surprised outsiders that the Mormon women accepted the custom as they did.

The main body of Latter-day Saints thus renounced plural marriage as a political necessity rather than from religious conviction. And they do not now argue that plural marriage was always a mistake, or even that there never was such a thing: it is still held to have been taught by God in a revelation to Joseph Smith.[1] A few groups clandestinely continued plural marriage, and claimed to be true Joseph Smith Mormons, holding that the Mormon Church had no right to denounce it: they were disowned by the parent body.

A schismatic group of L.D.S., indeed, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, have never approved of plural marriage. Joseph Smith's first wife, Emma, had never approved[2] of his plural marriages, and after his death she denied that he had ever

[1] Cf. Richards, op. cit., pp. 425–6, and Talmage, op. cit., pp. 422–4: the divine law of plural marriage is suspended, so that the Latter-day Saints can submit to the law of the land.

[2] According to *Doctrine and Covenants*, Section CXXXII, p. 473, supplementary wives were only to be taken with the consent of the first wife.

had a revelation authorizing them, or practised polygamy, and claimed that the alleged revelation was a forgery. They also differ from the main body in holding that the leadership should be passed from father to son—in 1860 they put the oldest son of Joseph and Emma Smith at their head—while the former believe that God calls the leader by revelation, without regard to their descent. The Reorganized L.D.S. are much less numerous than the parent body,[1] and relations with it are far from cordial.

A related Latter-day Saint belief is the doctrine of celestial marriage. The essence of this is that marriages contracted in the Mormon way last not only "till death us do part", but to eternity: marriages persist in heaven: a man has there all the wives he had on earth, and even children are born. Without the temple ordinances, this is, Mormon baptism and marriage, no one can attain to a celestial throne, that is, the highest of the three degrees of celestial glory. The ceremony of Mormon marriage, no less than baptism, can be performed vicariously by the living for the dead, when their marriage has not been performed by one having priesthood authority to bind both for time and for all eternity.

What has been said shows that there is in fact a great gulf between the L.D.S. and the historic Christian tradition. And this is borne out by the fact that they feel it to be their duty to convert all Christians to their own beliefs: their mission work is almost entirely among Christians, or those with at least some knowledge of Christianity, not non-Christians.

Apostasy from the doctrines, ordinances and discipline of the Church as it existed in the days of Christ and his Apostles has, it is claimed, been universal. The ancient Church, it is held, did not destroy paganism, it adopted it: none of the historic Churches has any divine authority, and so they cannot perform the saving ordinances of God: no man can minister in the ordinances and priesthood of God unless he is called as was Aaron. It was only in the last century that Almighty God restored his true Church to earth again: the powers of the priesthood have been brought back to earth by the ministry of angels.[2] In so-called Christendom to-day there are no inspired apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers: in their place are contending priests and teachers guided by the wisdom of men. Non-Mormon teachers are blind guides. Mormon baptism is indispensable for salvation, and all but Latter-day Saints will be everlastingly damned. It seems therefore unnecessary for the Mormons to blame, as they do, the enmity of the clergy for the antagonism they have often aroused.

It would therefore be the height of unreason if Christian Communions in the historic stream of the Christian Faith were to regard the Latter-day Saints as holding substantially the same beliefs. And

[1] The main body have in the U.S.A. about nine hundred thousand members, the Reorganized Latter-day Saints rather over one hundred thousand: the other groups are numerically insignificant. In the world as a whole there are about a million and a half Mormons.

[2] M. E. Peterson, *Which Church is right?* p. 16.

they could not be, probably they would not wish to be, admitted as members of the British Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., or the World Council of Churches.

G. F. S. Gray.

Studies in Texts

ACTS 13. 9: SAUL, WHO IS ALSO PAUL

"It is very unlikely that this name is mentioned here for the first time merely by accident. Three reasons may be suggested. 1. This begins a 'Paul' source. 2. It marks the coincidence of name with the proconsul, almost as though to say, 'Saul, who was another Paul'. 3. For the first time the writer was dealing with strictly Gentile surroundings.

"All three may be true, but the first may be the decisive factor."

So wrote Dr Cadbury in Volume 4 of *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 145. I present a fourth reason, more cogent, as I think, than these.

The incident of the encounter in Cyprus with the Jewish sorcerer Elymas forms, as it were, the water-shed in the Book of *Acts* and the turning-point in the ministry of St Paul. He and Barnabas, sent out from Antioch, had gone through the whole island of Cyprus, confining their ministry to the Jews. From the moment of this encounter with Elymas the Jew, they know what they are always to expect from Jews and they are prepared for a ministry to Gentiles.

"Saul, who is also Paul." Up to this point, Luke implies, you have been reading about Saul the Jew, Saul the Jewish antagonist of the Gospel and Saul the Jewish champion of it. From this point onwards you are to read of Paul, who turned his face to the Gentiles.

We read in Acts 13. 46 f. and 18. 6 and 28. 25 ff. how St Paul turned from the Jews to Gentiles. But the first and decisive shift was made in this encounter with the Jew Elymas. This was the moment when it was borne in upon Saul that he must be rather Paul, borne in upon the Jew that he must be rather the citizen of the world.

Paul turned in anger upon Elymas, who was not only himself rejecting the Gospel but also hindering the Gentile Sergius Paulus from hearing it. "Thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season." Here is the "fulfilment" of Isaiah 6. 9 f.: "See ye indeed, but perceive not . . . shut their eyes lest they see . . . and turn again and be healed." This passage is quoted in Mark 4. 12 and parallels, in John 12. 40, and in Romans 11. 8 as well as being hinted at more frequently. Cf. John 9. 39 for example.

It was Paul the "universalist" who convicted Elymas the Jew of this blindness by bringing upon him a blindness of the body that declared the blindness of his heart. Paul never ceased to be Saul; and it was Saul who wrote Romans 9. 1–3 and 10. 1, moved not only by profound sorrow for the blindness of the Jews, but also with something like a sense of guilt, at least a sense of responsibility, for their blindness; for his ministry, like Isaiah's, somehow brought blindness

upon his people, just as he had, in a sense, brought blindness upon Elymas.

We must note that Paul called down blindness upon Elymas "for a season", as the R.V. has it. The true meaning is rather "until the time". It was of that time that Saul was thinking when he wrote that "a hardening in part hath befallen Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved", Romans 11. 25 f. Compare also 11. 11 f.

Finally, it may be observed that John, who was also Mark, was not yet prepared for this decision. He, therefore, returned to Jerusalem, the home of Jewry, John still.

"Saul, who is also Paul." With this little phrase Luke proclaims the epoch-making character of this encounter in Cyprus.

F. C. Synge.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Wilson is the Chaplain of the Guild of Health.

Dr Glasson is Minister of Roupell Park Methodist Church, West Norwood.

The Rev. G. F. S. Gray is Rector of Fakenham.

The Rev. F. C. Synge is Dean of Christchurch College, New Zealand.

CORRESPONDENCE

FEWER MISSIONARY SOCIETIES?

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I lay down the article: "Fewer Missionary Societies?" in your March number with a heavy heart. Whereas the Editorial seemed to give glimpses of the emerging Church of the 1960s, this one breathed the atmosphere of the lawsuits, the labels, the neatly packaged parcels, the outworn attitudes of the High, Middle and Low—in short the atmosphere of the 1860s.

Why should it be assumed that people should only want to support a missionary society of a particular colour (their own, of course)? That we are to countenance the taking over by younger churches of all the Cox-and-Boxery, the mummified theological parochialism of nineteenth-century controversy? It is nothing short of tragic for the well-being of our Church if, now that the deadly distinctions have become largely irrelevant here at home, they should henceforth be perpetuated abroad. We are accused as a nation of exploiting our proletariat: must we as a Church tacitly connive at this exporting of our parochial (Protestant/Papist) propaganda as well?

When St Paul asked the Christians at Corinth for contributions

for the Saints at Jerusalem, he simply bade them: "on the first day of every week each of you is to put something aside and store it up, as he may prosper". He refers to people who have devoted themselves to the service of the Saints and concludes: "I urge you to be subject to such men and to every fellow-labourer and worker". I sincerely hope that this will be the criterion for missionary support at home: that people will look at the needs of Christians overseas, not at the niceties of their theologies.

Yours etc.,
GRAHAM DOWELL.

300 WESTERN BANK,
SHEFFIELD 10.

SIN AND INFANT BAPTISM

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Is not much of this talk about original sin rather off the mark? If Tillich is right when he says that the term "sin" "has been used in a way which has little to do with its genuine biblical meaning. Paul often spoke of 'Sin' in the singular and without an article. He saw it as a quasi-personal power which ruled this world. But in the Christian churches, both Catholic and Protestant, sin has been used predominantly in the plural, and 'sins' are deviations from moral laws. This has little to do with 'sin' as the state of estrangement from that to which one belongs—God, one's self, one's world"; and if we would go further with Tillich and reinterpret sin in terms of "estrangement", can we not reach a more satisfactory doctrine of baptism?

In baptism we have an effective sign of God's reaching out to cancel the estrangement between us and himself which is our human predicament. This is the cancellation of sin; which at least makes better sense than a blank cheque for the forgiveness of all future delinquencies. This is the grace of God, exercised through his Church, in his world. Practically, we should be unwise to set too much store in these days of social mobility on the faith of godparents, many of whom maintain only tenuous contact with their protégés. But who shall limit the grace of God either in baptism or in the subsequent nurture of the child? There are churches and schools, and books, and youth organizations, and wireless, and even television.

When Luther found himself in despair about his faith, he would write down the words *baptizatus sum*. And he was presumably baptized as an infant.

Yours faithfully,
M. A. H. MELINSKY.

SANDFORD, WAREHAM.

EPISCOPACY AND INTERCOMMUNION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

My friend Canon Bowles is right to draw attention to the movements of thought represented by the books he quotes. They are of British origin, but I could cap his point by mentioning such continental writers as Frère Max Thurian of Taizé. I am gratefully aware of these movements. The surviving doubts in my mind concern their representative character in the very wide, very diversified field of Protestantism. Confident judgment on this point seems to me very difficult and difference of opinion inevitable. That is why in my letter I did no more than ask questions and express doubts. We can only wait and see whether the type of Protestantism represented by the writers quoted will prevail.

Yours faithfully,
H. BALMFORTH.

6 THE CLOSE, EXETER.

STEWARDSHIP SETS US THINKING

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Stewardship movement is revolutionizing the life of many parishes and spreading very rapidly. But there is still one important issue which is in danger of going by default, the question of undifferentiated giving, i.e. giving as much as we can regardless of what the money is to be used for. There seems to be a serious weakness here in the approach of professional fund-raising companies, and Mr Skelton is surely right to question the slogan "The need of the giver to give". It is a half truth, and can have two dangerous consequences. In his article, "Stewardship sets us thinking", Mr Skelton warns us against one. Increased income may lead to increased parochial expenditure, *not all of it justified.* There is a real danger of what the Bishop of Johannesburg called "plush" religion, or at least a "plush" mentality, in sheer reaction from our previous state of penury.

The answer is sometimes made, "But we give away what we don't need". But this only underlines the other consequence of undifferentiated giving. If the parish does not "need" all the money it is getting, that extra money should have been left at the disposal of the individual members, for them to give away in charity. The decision about how much that should be, and where it ought to go, is surely an important exercise of their own Christian conscience and compassion. To remove the decision from them removes a vital part of their responsibility. Mr Skelton says that "every Christian family should give as much as it can each week, irrespective of the particular needs of the parish". If he means "give all it can *to the Church*", I cannot agree. We have a duty as Christians and citizens to support

many things which are outside the official concern of the Church.

I suggest that the failure is not merely in practice but in principle. There is, in fact, a double obligation in Christian giving, the limited one of providing for the Church and its proper needs, and the comparatively unlimited one of giving alms. The first proceeds from the fact that we are members of a body, and therefore are responsible for undertaking a fair share of the cost of its work. That may well include a generous quota for the Church overseas, as Mr Skelton implies.

The other obligation, to give alms, proceeds directly from our Lord's command to heal the sick and succour the distressed. In each case the appeal is to a different motive, the one to plain honesty, the other to our love for God and our neighbour.

The urgency of the matter lies in this, that in practice different schemes appeal to different motives, or sometimes to a confusion of motives and duties. And a scheme may be adopted in a parish before the consequences and effects are thoroughly realized, and lasting harm may be done.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN F. WALKER.

COCKERTON VICARAGE,
DARLINGTON.

BRAY LIBRARIES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

There is still at work in this country and overseas the charity known as the Bray Libraries. This foundation dates back to the time of the Rev. Dr Thomas Bray, who founded both S.P.C.K. and S.P.G., and who wished to provide facilities for clergymen and laymen desiring to do some serious theological reading.

The existing rules of the Bray Associates make it very easy for a local library to be formed. Twenty persons—preferably both lay and clerical—agree to become associated as reading members who choose one of their number to be the corresponding librarian. Each member pays a minimum subscription of 4s. per annum. This money, together with certain initial grants made by the Managing Associates and S.P.C.K., is applied to the purchase of books, which members themselves choose, for the stocking of the library. At the end of each year, the books that have formed the library are offered to the members, so that at reduced rates they can buy them for themselves. The money from the proceeds of such sale—together with the subscriptions for the new year—is used to re-stock the library with new books for the ensuing twelve months. To-day there are about one hundred of these libraries in existence, of which about seventy are in England and Wales.

I ask the courtesy of your columns for the publishing of this letter, because some of your readers may see how this scheme can provide

a solution to the problem of securing books for the use of readers at a time when the price of books is so very sigh.

The Managing Associates would be very glad to receive and answer inquiries which can be addressed to: the Secretary, Bray Associates, S.P.C.K., Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1.

Yours sincerely,

ERIC THORNTON.

Honorary Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGION AND CULTURE. Essays in honour of Paul Tillich. Edited by Walter Leibrecht. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 45s.

The work of Paul Tillich no longer needs introducing to English readers. *The Protestant Era* (1951), the two volumes of *Systematic Theology* (1953 and 1957), and the various collections of lectures, addresses and sermons, for all their not infrequent difficulties, have gained for their author a wide public on this side of the Atlantic and thus extended a reputation already well established both in his native Germany, where a collected edition is now in publication, and in the U.S.A., which, since 1933, has been his home. Tillich's mind is in fact to be reckoned among the major cultural forces of the contemporary Western world. The present collection of essays is therefore in the nature of a *Festschrift*, and the number and eminence of the contributors, including among others Barth and Jaspers, Reinhold Niebuhr and Erich Fromm, Karl Heim and Gabriel Marcel, Rudolf Bultmann and Emil Brunner, testify to the esteem in which the distinguished German-American thinker is to-day held. As the editor remarks in his preface: "The nature and diversity of the articles—which express, nonetheless, a common concern—suggest the wide horizons of Tillich's world, geographically as well as intellectually and spiritually."

But although Tillich's writings are now familiar to us it is very doubtful whether they have in this country made the impact that his continental and transatlantic admirers might have expected. Mr T. S. Eliot and Professor Arnold Toynbee were, it seems, among those who originally sponsored, or at least encouraged, Mr Leibrecht's tribute, but no English contribution is listed, though the contents-table names both a Japanese—Mr Yoshinori Takeuchi, of the University of Kyoto—and a Lebanese—Dr Charles Malik, the amiable President of the United Nations' General Assembly. Tillich is of course to be classed—if broadly—as an existentialist, and existentialism has on the whole made little headway with us. In this island, with Oxford near its centre, the philosophical climate remains unfriendly to a growth that has always appeared exotic; whilst our native theological traditions do not readily favour the metaphysically-geared and somewhat equivocal orthodoxy with which the existentialist standpoint, in its Christian aspect, is commonly associated.

No doubt we are at fault. Intellectually we persist in being insular. These doctrines, we may object, are neither philosophy nor theology as we are accustomed to it. And turning to almost any of Tillich's books we may feel that the elusive "profundity" of the thought—German, with an American accent—is always a little too intimidating. Nevertheless there is a good deal we can learn from them, given patience. They represent one of the most serious and sustained attempts on the part of a Christian theologian to re-think the meaning and implications of Christianity within the peculiar spiritual and cultural conditions under which the twentieth century now confronts us. For Tillich, despite the modern critics of an ancient and admirable tradition of thought, has always believed it to be his special intellectual vocation to combine the legacies of both Greece and the Bible and, so far as may be, to assign to our secular culture its due place in the perennial scheme of Christian endeavour. Hence indeed the title of this volume.

It would be impossible, in the space available here, to review the twenty-five papers which the editor has assembled. In subject-matter they are extremely diverse, ranging from Karl Jaspers on "The Individual and Mass Society" to Karl Barth on Mozart, from Reinhold Niebuhr on "Biblical Faith and Socialism" to Wilhelm Pauck on "Theology in the Life of Contemporary American Protestantism", from Bultmann on "Preaching" to Fr Florovsky on "The Predicament of the Christian Historian". The editor's own contribution on "The Life andMind of Paul Tillich" provides a useful introduction. Some of the papers, Bultmann's, for example, or Karl Loewith's on "Knowledge and Faith" or Thielicke's on "Christians and the Prevention of War in an Atomic Age", are excellent, and most have some particular merit of interest. But the writing generally is of a kind which readers with a preference for a more soberly matter-of-fact attitude towards intellectual issues may not always find to their taste. The besetting sin of almost all the contributors, including the most widely celebrated of them, is portentousness, a tendency to be solemn and obscure. The sooner our contemporary theologians rid themselves of this Delphic manner of utterance the better. The volume concludes with what is by no means the least valuable of its contents: a full bibliography, covering some twenty-nine pages, of Tillich's publications to date.

Bernard M. G. Reardon.

Parham Rectory,
Pulborough.

Jesus and the Future Life. A Study in the Synoptic Gospels. By William Strawson. Epworth Press. 30s.

Christian preachers and apologists are often taken to task by reasonable inquirers on the question of what can possibly be known about the future life. The development of Christian doctrine on this matter has it roots in the New Testament, and a study of the matter there goes a long way to providing a reasonable account for in-

quirers as well as enabling preachers and apologists to base their exposition of Christian belief concerning Heaven and the future life upon a firm and objective foundation. Mr Strawson has confined his study to the synoptic gospels which, he says, "still have the strongest claim to be regarded as authentic historical records".

By way of prolegomena to his study, he has considered matters such as the historicity of the gospels, mythology and the idea of a personal future life. One wishes a fuller discussion about the historicity of the gospels, and although he says some wise things about form criticism and typology, he does not appear to answer the question, "Upon what does the historicity of the synoptic gospels depend?" Later in the book there is an uncritical acceptance of the Q hypothesis without any defence or explanation.

The themes of the book—Heaven, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Kingdom of God, Death, Judgment, the fate of the lost and the destiny of the saved—are considered carefully and fully. The conclusions are well tabulated at the end of each important section and gathered together into a lucid summary in the final chapter. Mr Strawson's approach is conservative, balanced and empirical. He gives critical consideration of the views of modern commentators and approves those interpretations which clearly correspond to the main facets of the theme. Where the material allows, he tries to harmonize differences of interpretation without being bound by them. If his conclusions are not particularly imaginative or exciting, it is because he has not allowed himself the luxury of departing from a clear *prima facie* interpretation of scripture.

Nevertheless, the conclusions of this study are valuable and interesting, and the book reveals a penetrating insight into human nature. In the chapter on death, the importance of death for every Christian is firmly asserted. It is not to be disregarded, nor is fear of it to be judged as sub-Christian. The death of Christ, as well as being an atoning sacrifice, was in every sense a horror before which he felt pain and fear. Christ is present with his followers in their agony of pain and fear, suffering not only for them but with them, that he might lead them to victory. Mr. Strawson sees no evidence in the synoptic gospels for the idea of spiritual death, nor does he see any evidence for belief in remedial punishment. The punishment of the lost is their condemnation to extinction. The saved are given God's gift of eternal life—that life which belongs to the coming age. This age has already begun in the life and ministry of Christ. Certain conditions need to be fulfilled if eternal life is to be enjoyed. By obeying these the soul will enter into the life of heaven, into full communion with God and into the perfection of the joys and blessings of intimate relationships on earth.

No reader can fail to be impressed with the wealth of detail and evidence which Mr Strawson has patiently expounded in this book. He admits that he has not provided the fully developed Christian view about the future life, but claims that what he has written represents the central core of Christ's teaching. Unfortunately he does not substantiate this claim. While this does not affect the intrinsic value

of the study, one is left hoping that one day Mr Strawson will develop his theme in studies on the rest of the New Testament and on subsequent Christian tradition. The accuracy, clarity and objectivity of this book would recommend any further efforts he undertook.

The bibliography and indexes have been carefully prepared and are very useful aids to the student and preacher.

G. H. Walden.

Brisbane.

The Origin and Meaning of the Name "Protestant Episcopal". By Robert W. Shoemaker. American Church Publications. 1959. $3.95.

Addressing his Diocesan Convention in 1877, Bishop E. R. Welles, of Wisconsin, pointed out the crucial need for "a close inquiry into the origin and meaning of this phrase [Protestant Episcopal]—whether it is a necessary or wise style and title . . .". While a vast deal has been written about the aptness or inaptness of the name of the American Church, both before and after the Bishop's day, most of it has emerged from the rocky soil of partisan strife and has served to clarify next to nothing. The "close inquiry" we have needed so long has been given us in this lively and interesting study, the fruit of seven years of research, compilation and evaluation. The author, a layman and an assistant professor of history at Renselaer Polytechnic Institute, is to be commended for the pertinacity with which he has pursued a phrase through the historical records of several centuries, and for endeavouring to put the controversy over the "style and title" of the American Church on a proper basis.

That basis, the author contends, is largely semantic. In his view the appelation must be examined in the light of the linguistic changes that have occurred in America since the early nineteenth century. The suitability of the name of the Church was in dispute, he shows, before Tractarianism made its impact in the United States; indeed, the Oxford theology served only to cloud the issue by wrapping it in the hot mists of controversy over churchmanship. The basis of the dissatisfaction had its origin in a peculiarly American situation, viz., the changing character of the English language as spoken in these parts (cf. pp. 157, 164–5, 187, 192–3), and, in particular, the change in the meaning of the word Protestant.

Dr Shoemaker traces the several significations the term Protestant has had in American speech, supporting his survey with copious and judicious illustrations, and indicates that while the generic meaning of the term, "non-Roman", has remained constant, since c. 1820 it has come to signify not only "non-Catholic", but "Dissenting" as well. Thus, as it stands to-day in general American usage, the name Protestant Episcopal means "non-Roman, non-Catholic, Dissenting (and by implication, non-sacramental) Episcopal". The author urges the Church to decide, in view of this patent change, whether its name is now suitable. In order to assist the Church to make this

decision, he tries his hand at distinguishing between Protestantism and Catholicism as they are understood in current American speech, and at defining Anglicanism in terms of the Prayer Book standards, concluding that the Protestantism of that document is lost in a sea of Catholicism. Although some of his judgments appear cavalier and perhaps bespeak of the partisan spirit he himself constantly decries, he has shown conclusively, we think, that Anglicanism, whatever else it is, is not Protestant in the way that that term is popularly understood in America to-day.

Asserting then that the Church's name is now inaccurate and misleading, and that it ought speedily to be changed, Dr Shoemaker proposes that it be called simply "the American Episcopal Church". Such a title, he maintains, is at once "accurate, concise, palatable and historical" (p. 296). And this much at least is wise, for among the titles that have been proposed, this is the only one which has a remote chance of being accepted by the General Convention and the Church at large.

James A. Carpenter.

St Timothy's Church,
Alexandria, Louisiana.

Women and the Priesthood of the Church. By E. L. Mascall. The Church Union, Church Literature Association. 1960. 3s.

In this pamphlet Dr Mascall reiterates objections to the ordination of women which he has previously expressed in Theology, adds further arguments, and considers other publications on the subject. He modifies his earlier remarks, however, to the extent of recognizing that the psychological objections adduced by the late N. P. Williams are rather less than fundamental: the problem is basically theological, and Dr Mascall deals with it from this point of view.

He claims that there must be some reason for the restriction of the ministry to men by Jesus himself, and by the early Church, since both maintained "the absolute equality of women with men as members of the New Israel". Now the priest represents to his congregation the Fatherhood of God and the priesthood of Christ. God himself is described in masculine terms, and the incarnate Son, our High Priest, was a male individual; moreover, in Ephesians the relation between Christ and the Church is said to be analogous to the relation between husband and wife. It is unlikely that all this is purely accidental, and the necessary conclusion is that the priestly function is fundamentally masculine.

This is a plausible argument, but it becomes less convincing after closer examination. When we consider the ministry in the primitive Church it is the apostles who are theologically significant, and I have suggested elsewhere (*The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood*, pp. 87–90) that there was a theological reason for the exclusion of women from the original apostolate which does not apply to the apostles' successors. I have suggested also (op. cit. pp. 80–82) that the masculinity of the incarnate Son was due to the fact that in the

pre-Christian era women possessed no independent existence in God's Image. In that case, participation in the priesthood of Christ would entail, not biological masculinity *per se*, but existence in the Image of God, which is not, in the Christian dispensation, confined to persons of the male sex. Although Dr Mascall refers to other sections of my book he disregards these two points entirely. What is more, if we examine the meaning of the term "Father" as applied to God and the significance of the "sponsal relation" of Christ to the Church it is by no means clear that their representation by the human priest requires that the priest should be male. Scripturally, the term "Father" denotes authority: the authority of the Father is committed to Christ, and it is the direct authority of Christ which is exercised by the apostolic ministry. But this means that the authority of the priesthood is independent of human physiological or psychological characteristics, so that it makes no difference whether the priest is male or female. Secondly, if we apply to the priest what is said about Christ in Eph. 5, we find that his function demands a self-sacrificing love for his people and consists in their purification by means of Baptism and the ministry of the Word. It would be difficult to maintain that the first requirement may be possessed by male Christians only, and Baptism may be administered by a woman in cases of necessity; the question of whether a woman may exercise the ministry of the Word is curiously enough dismissed by Dr Mascall as irrelevant. While we may be grateful to him for advancing in some degree the theological discussion of the ordination of women, it is not possible to suppose that his pamphlet has concluded the debate.

M. E. Thrall.

Newark-on-Trent.

Theology of Culture. By Paul Tillich. O.U.P. 1959. 18s.

The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age. By G. D. Yarnold. George Allen and Unwin. 1959. 18s.

Culture has been Tillich's life-long concern. As he writes in the foreword to the present book, he has taken its title from that of his first published speech; and it is fitting that a new series of essays in his honour should be called "Religion and Culture". But this is not to say that he is interested in culture in the same way that somebody else might be interested in butterflies or a third person might say he was interested in religion. For him culture, religion and the whole of life are inseparable. In his own words: "Religion is not a special function of man's spiritual life, but it is the dimension of depth in all of its functions. . . . Religion as ultimate concern is the meaning-giving substance of culture, and culture is the totality of forms in which the basic concern of religion expresses itself. In abbreviation: religion is the substance of culture, culture is the form of religion". On such a view any separation between the religious and the secular realm must be seen as an emergency measure, a witness to man's

estrangement; it leaves us continually open to the danger that religion in the narrow sense will exalt itself into an ultimate, and so provoke the passionate, and basically religious, opposition of the secular world. Because this religious rejection of a separated religious realm is always taking place "genuine religion without an element of atheism cannot be imagined."

It is impossible to summarize or even abbreviate Tillich's writings, but these quotations give an idea of his general standpoint. The book itself is a collection of essays written during the last twenty years; it illustrates the working out of this approach in relation to a wide variety of topics including philosophy, art, science, psychoanalysis, ethics, education and politics. As in any such collection the essays are of varying quality and interest, but all are worth reading. Those who like Tillich will devour the book, and though many of its themes are familiar from his other writings, they will find plenty in it to illuminate his thought elsewhere. Those who do not like Tillich should read it, albeit with difficulty, because the author is saying something which everybody needs to hear. At least it is worth trying to whet their appetites with a couple of quotations: on ethics, "We cannot be obedient to the commands of a stranger even if he is God"; and on God as a projected father-image, "Every projection is not only a projection *of* something, but it is also a projection *upon* something. What is this 'something' upon which the image of the father is 'projected' so that it becomes divine? The answer can only be: It is projected upon the 'screen' of the unconditional! And this screen is not projected. It makes projection possible."

One thing for certain can be said about Dr Yarnold's book: Professor Tillich would disapprove of it. This is not to say that it is a bad book. The author is trying to do something fundamentally worthwhile in considering the effects of science on our understanding of the universe, on our belief in the Christian kerygma, and on the ethical problems which now confront us. At a certain level he succeeds. He summarizes clearly and readably much of the discussion on these subjects, which will already be familiar to those who have studied them. He places valuable emphasis on our need to make up our minds about the factual content of the Gospel. He is not afraid to face the difficulties of belief and the uncertainty of all our knowledge. If at times his discussion seems superficial, this may be because the book has been planned for clergymen who have not thought much about these matters before—or so it seems. But when all this is said, a lingering doubt remains that Dr Yarnold is still hankering after a false kind of reconciliation. What would Tillich, for example, make of the suggestion that random events on the sub-atomic level should be ascribed directly to the primary causality of God? or the even more delightful admission that the number of those fed in the wilderness by Jesus might be "substantially less than five thousand?"

J. S. Habgood.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS. By W. Telfer. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 12s. 6d.

This book can fairly be described as a little gem; certainly it causes regret that so little has come from Dr Telfer's pen and illustrates what can be done by a writer who starts from an intimate knowledge of the Fathers. He begins with the New Testament, where forgiveness is to begin with eschatological. The believer takes God's side against the powers of evil; he can count on holding out for the short time that remains. The first break with primitive tradition came with the Gentile Churches, when the hastily baptized inevitably relapsed into heathen ways. But the old tradition lived on in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Church entered the second century holding the original ideal. Penitence was humble recollection of pre-baptismal sins.

The next step was the teaching of Second Repentance, a once for all reconversion, not subject to repetition. "The Second Epistle of Clement" proclaims the new method. The third century witnessed widespread falling away under the pressure of persecution and the pastoral anxieties of the bishops in connexion with reconciliation. All was public; there is no trace in Cyprian's time of private penance. The mass movement towards the Church in the next century weakened discipline. After 400 Augustine's teaching became widely known in the Western Church; baptism released from pre-natal sin, that is sin in Adam, the natural bias towards sin remaining. Confession as we know it derives from Celtic Christianity; by 1215 it became universal.

The succeeding chapters on the Schoolmen, the Reformers, and the Council of Trent with the semi-Pelagian movement led by the Jesuits, are models of concise exposition, and when the reader comes to the Anglican compromise as seen in the Prayer Book and Hooker he is prepared to welcome it as a sane provisional solution of a problem that had perplexed the Church for many centuries.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

CHICHESTER.

WHAT IS A PRIEST? By Joseph Lecuyer, C.S.Sp. Faith and Fact Books 53. Burns and Oates. 7s. 6d.

What does the consecration of a bishop effect over and above the ordination of a priest? If the episcopate contains the fulness of the priesthood, it follows that the priest is given all the sacramental powers of the mystical body *in potentia* and may exercise them at the direction of the body. At his consecration the bishop is appointed for a work of judicial and administrative oversight of the mystical body. He may delegate the exercise of powers proper to himself to a priest who holds them *in potentia*. On the basis of this reasoning

the consecration of a bishop is not an ordination. It is simply an act of the mystical body granting a priest authority to exercise to the full those powers given to him in ordination. Père Lecuyer notes this line of argument, but also gives us evidence from St Thomas Aquinas in support of the view that the bishop at his consecration receives sacramental powers which concern the government of the people of God, especially the powers to confirm and ordain because these powers bestow a special function in the mystical body. Père Lecuyer also notes that, according to Aquinas, Irenaeus and Hipploytus, the bishop at his consecration receives a definite charism of truth by which the doctrinal authority of the apostolic body is established. The question whether the bishop, if he contains the fulness of the priesthood, receives any special powers at his consecration, or just simply authority to exercise priestly powers, requires fuller treatment than that offered in this book.

Its value is enhanced by an admirable discussion in the last chapter of the priesthood of the faithful. The chapter on the celibacy of the clergy is well written, but occasionally the case is overstated, for example in the sentence on p. 93, "Married people . . . are engaged . . . in a condition of disturbance imposed on them by conjugal life which can often be an obstacle or a difficulty for the seeking of God's kingdom." An author, arguing for clerical celibacy, is sometimes led to exaggerations about this vocation which, if he were writing on the sacrament of Holy Matrimony, he would have some difficulty in sustaining.

We must be grateful to Père Lecuyer for an informative and readable exposition of the Roman view of Order. Many of his points could provide a fruitful basis for ecumenical discussion.

G. H. Walden.

Dubbo,
New South Wales.

God's Kingdom and Ours. By Gabriel Hebert. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 10s. 6d.

Tell in the Wilderness. By Max Warren. Highway Press. 1959. 2s. 6d.

Into All the World. By Douglas Webster. S.P.C.K. 1959. 5s.

The People of God. By Donald Miller. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 8s. 6d.

Father Hebert has written another valuable and stimulating book. If one is left with the impression that the two halves fail to form a unity, that is only a superficial criticism. Both halves deserve attention.

The questions which he seeks to answer are such as these: Why is the Church regarded to-day as something out of date, its Gospel accounted a message of little relevance to the modern world? Has the Message been so integrated with the presuppositions of the pre-1914 era that its relevance is held to have perished with them?

A study of the impact of the West upon Asia and of the methods of the Church in Asia reveals the pervading presence of the sense of racial superiority. Of the evil consequences there is no need to speak. Not all the consequences were evil, however. The Indian Civil Service has a record for integrity and for devoted pastoral care that has never been matched. Yet its standards were built upon a sense of racial superiority and the responsibilities thereof. It was not, however, the India of the Indians that the Civil Servants were serving, but a special India of their own conception. With the intelligentsia they had no sympathy.

The sense of racial superiority induced in the Church a reluctance to let the young Churches stand on their own feet. They were so tied to white apron-strings that when India was granted independence and Asia came under Communist government, the Church was barely equipped to stand alone and it is regarded as a suspect, European society.

Turning to the Church in Australia and Britain, Father Hebert shows that there, too, the Church has been identified with a structure of superiority—not, indeed, of race, but of wealth and privilege and Clericalism. It is because all "superiorities" of this kind are now suspect that the Church itself is considered to be on the way out.

In the second half of the book Father Hebert investigates the superiority which the Church exists to proclaim—the Kingdom of God, God reigning and being obeyed. He has two chapters on what the Kingdom of God really is and what the Church really is; and finally he presents evidence that the Church "is trying to make a clean breach with some of its conventional habits and address itself with new vigour to the real task that lies before it".

He ends with great words spoken by Archbishop Woods at his enthronement in Melbourne Cathedral two years ago. "If God has cut away from under our feet every ground of confidence—Blessed be God. If in our day he has shewn us how morally bankrupt in a godless civilization—Blessed be God. If he has taught us that it does not befit his glory to be attached to any merely national culture—Blessed be God."

Dr Warren gives a picture, largely in quotations from letters received from C.M.S. missionaries, of the Church at work in a world where the white skin no longer commands automatic respect. He provides food for self-reproach and penitence, for prayer and praise and the giving of the glory to God.

Mr Webster has written an admirable study book, designed for those who would follow up the Lambeth Report. Because there is a frank facing of the faults of past and present and the difficulties of present and future, the book gives a clear and virile call to the Church.

The last book is the most quotable of the four, written in that lively clarity that betokens mastery of the subject. Perhaps Dr Miller falters whenh e comes to write of the Worship of the Church. There, suddenly narrowing his field to "The Reformed Church", his treatment becomes partisan. But with this exception the book is to be

recommended as a study of the Church that will invigorate and illuminate any study group and instruct clerical as well as lay readers.

F. C. Synge.

Christchurch, N.Z.

The Castle and the Field. By Harold Loukes. Swarthmore Lecture, 1959. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

Between God and History. By Richard K. Ullmann. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

George Fox and the Quakers. By Henry Van Etten. Trans. by E. Kelvin Osborn. Longmans. 6s.

These three books are concerned with a problem of the utmost importance, namely, how are we to know the will of God for us?—and they all approach it from a Quaker standpoint. In sharp contradiction to the note of quiet assurance which we are wont to associate with the Friends, we discover a strong spirit of questioning, which does not hesitate to lay siege to the fundamental presuppositions of the movement.

The present debate would appear to be one between the upholders of the form of the movement, and those who are wondering whether loyalty to the form, too narrowly interpreted, may not eventually destroy the Society, and mistake the will of God.

Maybe it may come as rather a shock to the non-Quaker to discover that there is something so definite as a form in Quakerism; he may say he wist not that there was anything more than spirit. But Meetings for Sufferings, waiting upon unanimity, plainness in apparel, even pacifism, may become as ossified as dogma or ritual. This finding is the fruit of Quaker experience, and the parent of much present disquiet.

Moreover, the ascertaining of the will of God has become also a technological process, like everything else; so complex, and so dependent upon specialist knowledge, that the old reliance upon spiritual intuition may seem too amateurish for modern conditions. A good deal of Ullmann's book is given to labour this very point; one which would not require so much weight of proof unless one had begun, as the Quakers have done, with the assumption that all we need is true simplicity.

I would not say that these books have given the answer to the Quakers' dilemma, which is their own version of the problem of how to combine pursuit of perfection with avoidance of spiritual arrogance. But the non-Quaker may learn a great deal from their very critical Quaker assessment of values which they may be inclined to belittle just because they are familiar with them. The balance between Fox's religious individualism, and his own doctrine of the collective wisdom of the whole society, though matter of history, called for a spiritual poise which is more valuable to us now than much of the sociological rethinking of the lectures of Ullmann, which can be more easily paralleled elsewhere.

To Harold Loukes, the contemporary answer to the riddle of Christian living lies in the discovery of what we mean by love, human and divine. He has as little use for the peculiarly Quaker safety device of the protection of the group as he has for the non-Quaker traditional walls of Church and sacraments, and believes that it is only in the wide world, and as he enters most fully into the human situation of the people around him, acting not according to rule, but to sympathy and insight, that the Christian discovers Christ in the present age. This is the doctrine of the Inner Light, and the divine seed in everyman, carried to its logical conclusion, but the process might destroy that corporate thinking which has been the essence of Quakerism in the past. Moreover, as van Etten says, is the divine seed still to be found in everyman?—when so often everyman is not allowed to behave, or even to think, as a man at all? And, still further to complicate the situation, Ullman will not allow us to find in success any guarantee that we are achieving the will of God; the Cross is the supreme example of human obedience, and apparent failure; try as we will, we cannot eliminate the element of contingency in all our efforts for the Kingdom of God; we know God through history, rather than in history, and the rather naive optimism of Fox's principle of being a kind of spiritual radar, "answering that of God in everyone", can find far less basis in the facts of human nature, distorted still further by the contemporary social structure, than he imagined.

So "Faith offers no solution of temporal problems, but it gives the power to tackle them and to live with them and not to be beaten by their insolubility." This rather negative conclusion of Ullmann seems to have little of the Quaker ring about it, and perhaps it represents the débâcle of that humanitarian Quakerism which has been its most popular "image" in recent times; but it does strike a deeper note, and so at the same time builds a bridge between the Quakers and other Christians who have not shared their tone of religious and ethical assurance. And any bridge between Christians, providing it be solid, as this is, offers real hope in a day when the maximum impact of all Christian forces is so badly needed.

R. R. Osborn.

Goodmayes.

Go Quickly and Tell. By Augustine Hoey, C.R. Faith Press. 1959. 6s

This is a short hundred-page book packed with information on every aspect of parochial and other missions from the preparation to the follow-up. Anyone who has ever attended a mission conducted by Father Hoey will recall his bold and often novel methods and recognize his right to speak with the authority of experience on this subject. For all the novel suggestions he gives, he constantly reminds us that "the newest evangelistic technique" is no substitute for "prayer and fasting". Any parish priest (of whatever "tradition"), considering or preparing for a mission, should undoubtedly read

this book where he will find a wealth of good advice. But what impressed me again and again as I read it was that much of the advice and many of the suggestions contained in it are applicable not only to missions, but to the everyday life of the parish and the parish priest. The author would, I know, be the first to agree that any concentrated mission must be part of the continuing mission of the Church in the parish concerned led by the incumbent. *Go Quickly and Tell* contains much that could help that continuing mission and its resident "chief missioner".

NORBURY. GUY BENNETT.

AN INTRODUCTION TO CHARLES WILLIAMS. By A. M. Hadfield. Robert Hale. 1959. 21s.

This is the first full-length study of Charles Williams to appear. Since his death in 1945 his reputation has steadily grown and, although a difficult and never wholly successful author, he is perhaps the most original Christian writer of his generation. But he remains a puzzling and controversial figure. You either like him or you don't.

This book is definitely for those who do. Mrs Hadfield was a personal friend of his and a colleague at the Oxford University Press, and her book is avowedly the testament of a disciple. It is an account of his life, a record of their friendship and a study of his ideas and writings. It is too early yet for a definitive biography to be written, but this book does give a most vivid impression of what Charles Williams was like and of the effect that he had on those who knew him. The portrait emerges of a generous, unworldly, and paradoxical figure, whose capacity for feeling and understanding cost him dear and enriched others immeasurably. He was as a man even more interesting than his books.

The account of his writings is interwoven with the account of his life, and it is here that the very personal nature of this book will cause disagreement. Granted that Williams cared most of all for his poetry, his novels are none the less important for an understanding of his ideas and deserve fuller treatment than they receive here. To devote five pages to the Amen House Masques as against one to *Descent Into Hell* is to provoke more protests than this present one. But on the poetry and on the doctrines of coinherence and exchange Mrs Hadfield is admirable, and those who cherish them will learn a lot from her. Charles Williams really practised what he preached and always insisted, rightly, that he was not a sentimentalist or a crank: and in his letters we can see his beliefs in action.

Was he the great man his friends believed him to be? Surely yes, and there is even more in his profound theological insight than is shown us here. This book encourages a serious consideration of his whole theological output, and has thus achieved its very proper aim.

GLEN CAVALIERO.

LINCOLN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

BOOK NOTES

Beyond Theology (Cambridge University Press, 37s. 6d.) is the autobiography of the late Edward Scribner Ames (1870–1958), edited by Van Meter Ames. Ames belonged to the left wing of the Disciples of Christ, and was a gracious and influential liberal protestant of a pragmatic cast of mind. His readable autobiography throws much light on the American religious outlook which he represented. *The Wood for the Trees: an outline of Christianity* is a revised edition of *The Wood* by a Religious of C.S.M.V. (Faith Press, 9s. 6d.). *Significant Church History* by R. Gordon Milburn (James Clarke and Co., 7s. 6d.) is an essay on the reaction of the churches to the development of biblical criticism during the last hundred years. *Albert Schweitzer: a study of his philosophy of life* by Gabriel Langfeldt (Allen and Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is the work of a Norwegian psychiatrist: it poses the question, "Is Schweitzer a Christian?" *A Word in Season* (Vallentine Mitchell, 25s.) is a collection of addresses and sermons by Dr Israel Brodie, the Chief Rabbi: they were delivered between 1948 and 1958. *Canon Law Revision 1959* (S.P.C.K., 17s. 6d.) shows each of the canons in the revised form in which it stood in November 1959, and will be appreciated by those who are engaged or interested in the labours of revision. *The Mass of the Roman Rite* by Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J. (Burns Oates, 70s.) is a revised and abridged edition of *Missarum Sollemnia*: it is handsomely produced and will be more useful than the original to readers who are not liturgical experts. *Classics of Protestantism*, edited by Vergilius Ferm (Peter Owen, 45s.), contains substantial extracts from *Theologia Germanica*, Luther, Calvin, Samuel Clarke, William Law, John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, W. E. Channing, Schleiermacher, Kierkegaard, Bushnell, Theodore Parker, Ritschl, Inge, Rauschenbusch and Barth. Since some of the original works are now hard to come by, this volume, which runs to nearly 600 pages, will be a serviceable text-book for students. We are glad to report that Oliver and Boyd have reprinted the three volumes of *Calvin's Tracts and Treatises* (£5 5s.) in Henry Beveridge's translation with an introduction by Professor T. F. Torrance. As in the 1844 edition of the Calvin Translation Society, the first volume contains tracts and treatises "On the Reformation of the Church" (together with Beza's short life of Calvin), the second volume "On the Doctrine and Worship of the Church", and the third "In Defence of the Reformed Faith". Theological libraries, which are not furnished with the old edition, will now be able to fill the gap.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Norman Bentwich, *The Religious Foundations of Internationalism* (21s.).

AQUIN PRESS: Walter Ullmann, *The Medieval Papacy, St Thomas and Beyond* (2s.).

BLOOMSBURY PUBLISHING CO.: Conrad Pepler, O.P., *Sacramental Prayer* (10s. 9d.).

BUDD AND GILLATT (ST LEONARDS-ON-SEA): F. W. B. Bullock, *Evangelical Conversion in Great Britain 1696–1845* (35s.).

BURNS AND OATES: Gaspar Lefebvre, O.S.B., *The Spirit of God in the Liturgy* (7s. 6d.); Amédée Brunot, S.C.J., *St Paul and his Message* (7s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Colin Alves, *The Kingdom* [a course on the New Testament for the 13–14 age group] (8s. 6d.); M. F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel* (25s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Yves Congar, O.P., *The Mystery of the Church* (24s.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY: A. P. Carleton, *How shall I study the Psalms?* (Rs 3).

COLLINS: Ronald Gregor Smith, *J. G. Hamann* (21s.); William Purcell, *The Plain Man Looks at Himself* (12s. 6d.).

DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: Henri de Lubac, *The Discovery of God* (18s.); Charles Couturier, S.J., *The Mission of the Church* (10s. 6d.).

DESCLÉE DE BROUWER: Louis Monden, *Le Miracle, Signe de Salut* (n.p.).
EDITIONS DU SEUIL: André Dodin, *St Vincent de Paul et la charité* (n.p.).
EPWORTH PRESS: William Barclay, *The Promise of the Spirit* (5s.); J. Yeoman Muckle, *Isaiah 1–39* (12s. 6d.).
FABER AND FABER: Josef Pieper, *Prudence* (12s. 6d.).
FAITH PRESS: G. Huelin, *St Willibrord and his Society* (5s.); P. F. Anson, *Fashions in Church Furnishings 1840–1940* (50s.).
FONTANA BOOKS: Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (2s. 6d.).
HAMISH HAMILTON: Fred Berthold, Jr, *The Fear of God* (21s.).
INDEPENDENT PRESS: John Baker, *The Approach to Calvary* (6s. 6d.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Massey H. Shepherd, *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* (7s. 6d.); Gerhard von Rad, *Moses* (2s. 6d.); Joost de Blank, *A Working Faith* (7s. 6d.).
MIRFIELD PUBLICATIONS: Mark Tweedy, C.R., *Wheat among the Tares: impressions of the Russian Church to-day* (1s. 6d.).
MOWBRAY: Martin Sullivan, *Draw near with Faith* (4s. 6d.); R. R. Williams, *Reading through Hebrews* (5s.); Kenneth Mackenzie, *The Meaning of Churchmanship* [reissue of a book published in 1940: see THEOLOGY, January 1941, p. 50] (7s. 6d.); A. E. Campion (Ed.), *Prayers for Christian Healing* (8s. 6d.); Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (Trans.), *St Bernard of Clairvaux* (10s. 6d.).
NELSON: Hugo Rahner, S.J., *Saint Ignatius Loyola—Letters to Women* (63s.).
OLIVER AND BOYD: Dietrich Ritschl, *Christ our Life* (12s. 6d.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Horton Davies, *A Mirror of the Ministry in Modern Novels* (26s.); Edgar H. Brookes, *The City of God and the Politics of Crisis* (10s. 6d.).
PENGUIN BOOKS: J. W. C. Wand, *The Church To-day* (3s. 6d.).
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Paul M. Harrison, *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition* (40s.).
ST ANTHONY'S PRESS (YORK): E. Milner-White, *Sixteenth-Century Glass in York Minster and in the Church of St Michael-le-Belfry* (3s. 6d.).
ST THOMAS PRESS (TEXAS): T. Robert Ingram, *The Two Powers* [on the Christian use of the power to kill] ($1.00); T. Robert Ingram, *Sacred Studies* [an outline for class use with nine-year-olds] ($2.95).
S.C.M. PRESS: D. S. Russell, *Between the Testaments* (12s. 6d.); George A. F. Knight, *Hosea* (9s. 6d.); Ian T. Ramsey, *Freedom and Immortality* (16s.); A. R. C. Leaney, *The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon* (10s. 6d.); Lesslie Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church* [new edition] (21s.); Brevard S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (9s. 6d.).
SEABURY PRESS (CONNECTICUT): O. Jessie Lace, *Teaching the Old Testament* ($1.65).
SHEED AND WARD: Caryll Houselander, *A Rocking-Horse Catholic* (10s. 6d.).
SOCIETY OF THE SACRED MISSION: *H. K. of Kelham: an account of the life and teaching of Father Kelly* (2s.).
S.P.C.K.: *Baptism and Confirmation* [a cheap edition of the Liturgical Commission's report, published in 1959] (3s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K. AND THE SEABURY PRESS: Miles Lowell Yates, *God in Us* (9s. 6d.).
TYNDALE PRESS: Ralph P. Martin, *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (8s. 6d.); R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel according to St John* (9s. 6d.).
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM (O.U.P.): W. A. Whitehouse, *Order, Goodness, Glory* (9s. 6d.).
VISION PRESS: William Kluback and Martin Weinbaum, *Dilthey's Philosophy of Existence: Introduction to Weltanschauungslehre* (25s.).
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES (GENEVA): A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (n.p.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON